



Depopulation

 **Der Enzige**
SEP 26, 2024

128 36 20

Share



im aware of the irony of posting an article about depopulation & making a very breedable woman the thumbnaill

This is another article taking aim at something that's generally associated with the left, and recontextualizing it.

Lamenting about birthrates among White populations have been a mainstay of the RW for decades. This includes more moderate conservative types complaining that minorities have too many kids, albeit that angle is usually related to them draining welfare. This issue is common in the developed parts of the Orient as well.

The reasons are fairly obvious. Whites not having kids is what the left used as an excuse to import brownoids, even if their argument that they contribute to the economy is usually false as migrants virtually always are a net drain. Further, low birthrates in Whites & higher birthrates in nons will inevitably lead to a White minority. All very practical reasons.

Another reason is that Christians (mainly) have a weird obsession with having 8 kids. This is usually internet types that do not have a wife. Mormons & the Amish are real examples of this, as they often have fairly large families & this behavior is highly encouraged. Mormon housewives actually compete amongst themselves to see who can have the most kids sometimes, which is pretty funny.

Obviously, when I show support for depopulation it isn't aimed at Whites. Nor is this an issue that applies to any specific individual, more so a take on policy making in the distant future. If you feel the need to have 10 kids, more power to you so long as your wife isn't dysgenic or brown. I plan on a large family myself, if I'm alive in the coming years.

...

Firstly, it's not mathematically possible to reverse demographic change this way. At least in America, this may be different in some Euro nations.

The non-White population of the US is likely already over 50%. Having kids simply isn't enough, especially taking into account how many of the White population is already undesirable to keep around anyway. The only solution to the demographic problem is mass remigration (or more violent alternatives :3) & separatism.

If you plan on starting a family, you should do so in a White stronghold like New England, the PNW, or a Heartland era. We've already lost so much territory in the southern regions, it's best to consolidate & avoid losing more. It's worth noting that regardless of percentages, there are over 150 million Whites in America. If a hypothetical ethnostate popped up after US balkanization or something, 10% of that number would be twice the population of Sweden. We have enough people, and should focus on those people instead of trying to convince people to have a ton of kids.

Further, convincing people to breed like rabbits is a lost cause. Birthrate collapse is overwhelmingly caused by forces well beyond our control. The weird wine mom millennial that writes salon articles about not having kids to save the environment or whatever is a rare breed, very few people actually think like that in reality. As much as people like to doompost their Twitter posts, it's simply not that common. It's also exclusive to followers of the worst ideologies, and I for one would rather they don't pass on their idiocy.

Even on Tinder, which isn't exactly home to the most savory of women, virtually everyone considers themselves either "open to kids" or "wants kids." This holds true for other dating apps as well. This is among 18-24 year olds, who generally aren't in a stage of life where this matters much so it's noteworthy.

The collapse in birthrates is overwhelmingly an issue with society. Modern society, regardless of what one may say the reasons are, is a depressing hellscape. This is evident by the disturbingly high rates of suicide & prevalence of mental health issues among the younger generations. A lot of people simply don't feel comfortable having kids because they themselves don't even want to be alive.

The economy is also horrible. Not in a "inflation too high & homes are too expensive" way, the current economic system is simply unsustainable. I doubt it's controversial among our crowd to say that women shouldn't be a major part of the workforce. I don't hold this view because of any nonsense about tradition or anything, or because of any issues with the competency of women (valid). The simple issue is that the business class jumped on the "women shouldn't be discriminated against in the workplace" & made it so that women are expected to work. We now find ourselves in a position where it's not economically feasible for the vast majority of people to sustain a family based on a single income earner. Women aren't only socially expected to work, but are forced to in order to afford a home & family.

This is the principal reason why birthrates are declining below replacement levels, it's extremely difficult to be a proper mother. I watch a lot female commentators on youtube, just to see what they have to say, and they often say the same things. They'll often say it's due to late stage capitalism or something else endemic to leftist phrasing, but they agree with us on a surprising number of the less controversial issues like this.

Essentially, the issue with birthrates isn't one of ideology but simply that the system is hostile to it. People not having kids is something that can only be solved by radically changing our economic system in a way that's wholly impossible with the current government. What comes after the US will have to deal with the issue as it designs its social & economic policies. The NSDAP had various fertility programs, as Germany also had a demographic problem due to the Weimar Republic & Great Depression, which provides potential remedies. Other countries have had success with their programs as well, all essentially just getting women back into their habitat & providing economic benefits/support for families.

Once people feel safe & economically able, they will inevitably have kids. The breeding kink cane free with your fucking biology. Doing other things like banning abortion & harmful birth control (namely the pill, which should not be legal given it's effects), this will only improve numbers.

Regardless, that's not the point of this article.

...

But even then, too many people just decreases the quality of life for everyone. Urban sprawl, oversized crowds, overconsumption, the list goes on. When we talk about overpopulation, it's not just the physical space that these people actually take up. It's the amount of resources like farmland that are required to sustain these populations. Civilization takes more than a few million to sustain itself, but we should also avoid letting this get out of hand.

Further, we're reaching a point where vast amounts of the population simply aren't needed. This is a common talking point among the socialist & anti-work crowd, but it is true. A lot of industries that would formerly need dozens or hundreds of people (like large farms or factories) now only need a few, specialized workers. It's entirely possible to run entire factories with only a dozen educated workers, generally engineers, programmers, and other STEM types. Outside of a couple oddballs like the janitor or quality assurance, this is only a handful of college educated people. The era of vast assembly lines employing the entire local workforce is long gone & getting more unlikely by the day.

This isn't even touching on the growing number of useless jobs that contribute nothing to society other than providing a job.

There's a lot of economic issues that will come with this, but that's for another day. The main takeaway here is that the number of people necessary to sustain society is growing smaller by the day & the lower castes of society are becoming increasingly unnecessary.

Instead of trying to figure out some welfare state or UBI to sustain these lower echelons, perhaps we should just gradually phase them out.

So, how might this be achieved?

This is easy within our own borders via simple conditioning. Make it the norm for couples to have 1-3 children to average out to replacement levels. This doesn't require any legal intervention, it ultimately doesn't matter if some people have more or less. Eugenic programs will obviously emphasize higher birthrates among higher quality people while the lowest quality will be heavily discouraged from carrying on their genes in large numbers. But for the 90% of the population that isn't noteworthy enough to be of particular interest to eugenic programs, this would be fine & shift up or down based on the needs at the time.

The harder question is the rest of the world.

This is obviously complicated as many countries wouldn't take much of a liking to outsiders trying to decrease their birthrates. However it's certainly not impossible.

The most obvious answer, if our hypothetical nation has a good amount of sway internationally, is provide incentives for foreign governments to depopulate themselves. Just like how the US will give aid under the condition of legalizing gay marriage & diversity. This will at least help halt the growth of some countries.

The next answer, CRISPR. I have a certain level of qualifications in the field of CBRN warfare for reasons I'm not at liberty to discuss, but during my time in that field I learned about the weaponization of CRISPR, or better known as gene editing. While there's all sorts of things that will come from this development, the most important for us is it's use as a bioweapon.

While it's perfectly possible to use it to make the 7 plagues of Egypt, that probably wouldn't be a very popular decision. A better option would probably be to just sterilize them, Bill Gates style. This will inevitably lead to population collapse over a few decades. This would be fairly easy to deploy, simply drop it in the population centers like Shanghai or New Dehli & let it spread. Put it in the Mosquitoes if you want, doesn't matter.

A key part of CRISPR that I should mention is that it's capable of being ethnically targeted. This means you can make it so it only affects people with certain DNA, effectively shielding your own population from any adverse effects.

The other answer is the classic global thermal nuclear war, which is probably best avoided if possible.

It should be noted that most countries that are problems when it comes to overbreeding would likely collapse without being propped up by the West. Africa would lose its aid, China would lose its market, India would do both. It simply isn't possible for these places to sustain themselves without the White man's burden being held up.

There's a potentially infinite amount of options for depopulation, all specified for the needs of the specific situation & whatever ethical concerns one may have. This shouldn't be taken as advocacy so much as providing potential options to show it's certainly not impossible.


...

To conclude, have kids. Just don't get too caught up in the whole pro-natalism thing just because our enemies are anti-natalists. The reason I make these articles standing against traditional RW beliefs isn't to be contrarian, but to remind people to maintain a sense of nuance.

Hail Victory.

Subscribe to ICONOCLAST
by Der Enzige · Launched a year ago
Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.

By subscribing, I agree to Substack's [Terms of Use](#), and acknowledge its [Information Collection Notice](#) and [Privacy Policy](#).


 128 Likes · 20 Restacks

128 36 20


Share

Discussion about this post

CommentsRestacks



Write a comment...



Hessian · Sep 26


♥ Liked by Der Enzige

"Eugenics program" but it's just me in a locked room full of European long jump women and a bag of blue chev

♥ LIKE (28)

🗨 REPLY

🔗 SHARE



Apollinaire · Sep 26

♥ Liked by Der Enzige

Honestly, yeah, just stop sending aid to all nonwhite countries and just watch them implode. This is like le bad for mul economy or something so it probably will never ever even happen under this system. Perhaps something for Barron to consider? Anyways. Double the child tax credits for any family with two parents over 100 IQ, and provide them a UBI of \$10,000 annually if they are over 115 IQ. This probably will also never ever ever happen under our system because of the gazillions of dysgenic mutts that infest every level of our government like a plague of locusts or perhaps even rats.

Positive Eugenics (i.e. only using reward incentives for good genes and not using negative incentives for bad genes) has a possibility of appealing to a great deal of people and won't result in that much moral browbeating. "Erm it's bad that the gov't will just give you money for existing because... erm... I won't get any of it, you fucking chud!" Just drop a nuke on the welfare system and funnel all that money into positive eugenics programs. Make everyone get a regular free IQ test kind of similar to how you need to take a driver's test every time your license expires or something. Call it like the "Increase Intelligence Incentive" and advertise it in blue cities as like a thing that will only hurt rural MAGA/turd hicks and give them their fucking equitable socialism they want so bad.

♥ LIKE (21)

🗨 REPLY


🔗 SHARE

2 replies


34 more comments...

TopLatestDiscussions


Zero Tolerance
Stop pretending enemies are friends.
APR 8 · 2024 · DER ENZIGE




Winds of Change
America, & Europe, have moved massively to the Right.
MAR 2 · DER ENZIGE



National Socialism Contra Fascism
"One might almost say that fascism has reacted upon the creative life of the Italian people somewhat like a sterilization."
APR 8 · DER ENZIGE



See all >



Discover more from ICONOCLAST
Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.

By subscribing, I agree to Substack's [Terms of Use](#), and acknowledge its [Information Collection Notice](#) and [Privacy Policy](#).

Already have an account? [Sign in](#)